

1 Michael B. Reynolds, Bar No. 174534  
2 mreynolds@swlaw.com  
3 Colin R. Higgins, Bar No. 268364  
chiggins@swlaw.com  
4 Cameron J. Schlagel, Bar No. 320732  
cschlagel@swlaw.com  
5 SNEL & WILMER L.P.  
600 Anton Blvd., Suite 1400  
6 Costa Mesa, California 92626-7689  
Telephone: 714.427.7000  
Facsimile: 714.427.7799

7 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

8  
9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
10 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

11 THE UNITED STATES  
12 SPORTSMEN'S ALLIANCE  
13 FOUNDATION, an Ohio nonprofit  
14 corporation; SAFARI CLUB  
15 INTERNATIONAL, an Arizona  
16 nonprofit corporation; and  
17 CONGRESSIONAL  
18 SPORTSMEN'S FOUNDATION,

19 Plaintiffs,  
20 v.  
21

22 ROB BONTA, in his official  
23 capacity as Attorney General of the  
24 State of California; and DOES 1-25,  
25 inclusive,  
26

27 Defendants.  
28

Case No. 2:22-cv-01395-DAD-JDP

**Stipulation and Joint Motion to Stay  
Proceedings Pending Appeal**

23 Plaintiffs the United States Sportsmen's Alliance Foundation, Safari Club  
24 International, and Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation (collectively,  
25 "Plaintiffs"), on the one hand, and Defendant Rob Bonta, on the other hand (jointly,  
26 the "Parties"), through their respective attorneys of record, hereby stipulate and  
27 jointly move this Court for an order staying this action pending the resolution of  
28

1 Plaintiffs' appeal to the Ninth Circuit of this Court's Order Denying Plaintiffs'  
2 Motion for Preliminary Injunction ("Order") (ECF No. 23).

3 On August 5, 2022, Plaintiffs filed their complaint (ECF No. 1) in this  
4 matter, challenging California's recently enacted Assembly Bill 2571 ("AB 2571")  
5 as unconstitutional on multiple grounds. Plaintiffs subsequently filed their  
6 operative First Amended Complaint (ECF No. 12) and, on October 21, 2022, filed a  
7 motion for preliminary injunction (ECF No. 13), asking this Court to enjoin the  
8 enforcement of AB 2571 during the pendency of this action. Defendants opposed  
9 that motion (ECF No. 17).

10 On January 12, 2023, this Court issued the Order denying Plaintiffs' motion  
11 for preliminary injunction (ECF No. 23). On February 10, 2023, Plaintiffs timely  
12 appealed the Order to the Ninth Circuit (ECF No. 25). That appeal is currently  
13 pending.

14 The Parties jointly request that this Court issue a stay of proceedings pending  
15 Plaintiffs' appeal of the Order. When a party appeals a preliminary injunction, the  
16 district court has discretion to issue a stay of proceedings "incidental to the power  
17 inherent in every court to control the disposition of the causes on its docket with  
18 economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants." *Rivers v. Walt*  
19 *Disney Co.*, 980 F. Supp. 1358, 1360 (C.D. Cal. 1997) (citing *Landis v. North Am.*  
20 *Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936)). A court must consider several factors when  
21 deciding whether to exercise that discretion to issue a stay: 1) the "possible damage  
22 which might result from granting a stay," 2) the "hardship or inequity which a party  
23 might suffer in being required to go forward," and 3) the "orderly course of justice  
24 measured in terms of the simplifying or complicating of issues, proof, and questions  
25 of law which could be expected to result from a stay." *CMAX, Inc. v. Hall*, 300  
26 F.2d 265, 268 (9th Cir. 1962). Moreover, "[T]he filing of a notice of interlocutory  
27 appeal divests the district court of jurisdiction over the particular issues involved in  
28

1 that appeal.” *City of Los Angeles, Harbor Div. v. Santa Monica Baykeeper*, 254  
2 F.3d 882, 886 (9th Cir. 2001).

3 Good causes exists here for a stay. Because of the scope of Plaintiffs’  
4 motion for preliminary injunction and the Order, Plaintiffs’ appeal has divested this  
5 court of jurisdiction over most if not all substantive matters at issue in this  
6 litigation. To the extent any jurisdiction remains in this Court, the relevant factors  
7 also favor a stay. Neither party would be damaged by a stay—to the contrary, a  
8 stay would benefit both parties by sparing them the potentially unnecessary expense  
9 and time of contemporaneous litigation in this Court and the Court of Appeals. A  
10 stay of the proceedings would also promote the orderly course of justice by  
11 permitting the Ninth Circuit to simplify the issues in this case before proceedings  
12 resume in this Court.

13 For these reasons, the Parties respectfully ask the Court to enter the  
14 concurrently filed [Proposed] Order and thereby stay proceedings in this Court  
15 pending Plaintiffs’ appeal of the Order.

16  
17 [Signatures on Next Page]  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 Dated: April 26, 2023

Respectfully submitted,  
2 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.

3 By:  
4

5 Michael B. Reynolds  
6 Collin R. Higgins  
7 Cameron J. Schlager  
8 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

9  
10 Dated: April 26, 2023  
11 ROB BONTA  
12 Attorney General of California  
13 ANTHONY R. HAKL  
14 Supervising Deputy Attorney General

15 By: /s/ Gabrielle D. Boutin (auth on 4/26)  
16 Gabrielle D. Boutin  
17 Deputy Attorney General  
18 Attorneys for Defendant Attorney  
19 General Rob Bonta, in his official  
20 capacity

21 **Snell & Wilmer**  
22 L.L.P.  
23 LAW OFFICES  
24 1920 Main Street, Suite 1200  
25 Irvine, California 92614-7230  
26 (949) 253-2700